



Orem Public Works Advisory Commission Meeting Minutes

7:00 a.m. Tuesday, August 18, 2015
Orem Public Works Department
Conference Room 2
1450 West 550 North

CONDUCTING: Tai Riser

ATTENDING:	K.C. Shaw	Luke Peterson	Bill Peperone
	Chris Tschirki	Neal Winterton	Lawrence Burton
	Lane Gray	Kim Watson	Tom Macdonald
	Reed Price	Carol Walker	Stan Roberts
	Debbie Lindsay		

ABSENT/EXCUSED: Val Hale

VISITOR: Craig Wood

APPROVED

Tai Riser welcomed everyone. There was not a quorum present at the beginning of the meeting so approval of the June 2015 minutes were postponed until a quorum was present. Tai turned time over to Chris Tschirki for the Master Plan Update.

Chris reminded everyone that there is an Open House scheduled tonight at 6:00 p.m. to be held at the Senior Friendship Center. He was pleased with the attendance at the last Open House. They counted 81 individuals who attended the Open House two weeks ago.

Tom Macdonald asked how many of the Commission members were unable to attend the last Open House. Several raised their hands. Tom said that out in front of the Senior Center there was an alternative view being presented by Councilman Hans Andersen. Councilman Andersen was handing out information contrary to what we were presenting inside the building.

Chris said that Councilman Andersen was instructed that he should not be doing this as a candidate on City property.

Tai pointed out that Councilman Andersen had a large van/box truck parked out front and that at the "Meet the Candidate" night and they were told that was okay.

Chris said it was for the "Meet the Candidate" night, but not the Open House. Chris handed out several articles that Mr. Andersen is taking information from. The articles were a National Geographic article titled "13 Things You Probably Don't Know About the U.S. Water System (But Should)" by Charles Fishman, an article from The Rotarian titled "Can We Take Our Water for Granted?" also by Charles Fishman and an article from The Wall Street Journal titled "Water Meters Begin to Get Smarter: Utilities hope that the more consumers know, the less they'll consume" by Cecilia Wang. Mr. Fishman also wrote a book titled "The Big Thirst" which

is where these articles were found. Chris said they found some great information and some really nice gems. Chris said that they investigated some of these reports and quotes. These will be handed out at the meeting to the public so that they can see the full context from which Mr. Andersen is taking snippets from. Chris feels that Mr. Andersen has actually done us quite a favor in bringing some additional information forward and shedding light on some issues. Chris feels that most of what Mr. Andersen is quoting has been taken out of context. Chris presented this to the City council in a work session to inform the Council where Mr. Andersen is getting his information and why he is saying what he is saying. Chris high-lighted the information Mr. Andersen is quoting in green in each article. Chris has highlighted some information in red that give it context. He said that the articles, in general, are very supportive of a plan like we are approaching right now. Chris pointed to the article from The Rotarian. Mr. Anderson quoted “I have a favorite water main. This particular pipe sits under a busy and prestigious neighborhood at the center of Washington, D. C. The cast iron pipe was installed in 1860. It supplies clean drinking water, as it has for 154 years, and runs under K Street, home to the capital’s lobbying firms.” Chris continued to read (in red) more of the article *not* quoted by Mr. Andersen: “There are many old water pipes buried in lots of cities. I love this one because it captures the state of ignorance Americans live in with regard to water and the work that’s necessary to make sure it’s always on tap to brew coffee and flush toilets.” Chris then quoted again (in red) from the bottom of the same article: “The invisibility of our system, which for more than 100 years has been a testament to the genius and forethought of the engineers who first designed it, is undermining that system now. The water supply system is crumbling. We just don’t see it.” Chris pointed out that as you read the full context you understand what the author is trying to portray. These articles will be handed out tonight at the Open House. We have created an informative article titled “Fact or Fiction. The Truth about Orem’s Utility Plan” that speaks to what is being portrayed and what we feel the facts are. Chris brought specific attention to one item on the flier regarding the 10 million gallon water tank that we would like to build that is in our master plan. This tank would be for the City of Orem only. It is in no way intended to provide water to the Town of Vineyard. The City of Orem and the Town of Vineyard have an agreement that has been in place since the early 2000’s that states the Town of Vineyard is responsible to pay for and build its own storage facility. We have since received documentation from Vineyard stating that they have gone through a preliminary design and have plans in place to build their own water storage facilities in the Town of Vineyard itself.

Reed Price asked Chris if he would explain why we need a 10 million gallon water tank.

Chris explained that over the years we have been utilizing a good portion of Central Utah Water Conservancy District (CUWCD) storage. We currently have 22 million gallons of storage in the City. The study that Bowen Collins did for us suggests that we need around 32 million gallons today for the City of Orem. As CUWCD is expanding with its clients and customer base it needs to utilize every bit of storage that it has built for itself, not just for Orem and others.

Our visitor, Craig Wood, asked about something he read on the website. He read that CUWCD has 10 million in their storage and we have 10 million in their storage.

KC corrected that to Orem owning 9.5 million.

Chris said that we sold .5 million to (could not understand as there were other conversations going on.) for the cost for which it was built.

KC pointed out that we should not fool ourselves in to thinking that a 20 million tank provides 20 million gallons worth of storage. We can never operate the tank at its full capacity.

Mr. Wood wanted clarification as to whether we have a contractual agreement for what we put in to the tank that we have a certain percentage of the storage of that tank.

Chris said that we do pay for half of that in the tank.

Reed pointed out that we have been using the other half free of charge.

Chris said that there is other storage at the CUWCD facility. There is a 15 million gallon tank and we have several 2 million gallon tanks as well. CUWCD has another 2 million gallon tank as well. This is just one component of many. The bottom line is that CUWCD needs that storage now than ever before to provide water for its customer base which starts in Vineyard and goes north all the way to Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District and out to Eagle Mountain to the west.

KC also pointed out that it includes Provo City as well.

Chris explained that we created the "Fact or Fiction" sheet after taking a lot of questions from what has been portrayed to the public. As people have come in to the Open House they have literature from Mr. Andersen saying what we are doing is wrong, etc... This helps counter that misinformation. Chris said that we do respond to all the concerns citizens may have. He feels that the public is leaving the meeting with a different mindset.

Tom reminded everyone that 3,700 people voted for Hans and 81 came to the meeting. We are not scratching the surface. We can be believers in this meeting but we will have to substantially cut what we are proposing. He doesn't feel there is an "appetite" to get it all passed. We will have to spread it out over more years and reduce expenses. We may be right but we are touching so few people with our correctness.

Tai pointed out that is his biggest concern as he has talked to people. Hans is campaigning 100% on what we are discussing here in our meetings.

KC asked if we will be mailing out the "Fact or Fiction" sheet. Chris said that we could do that. He asked if we could include it in the utility bill.

Neal suggested it would be better to wait until after the second Open House to see what the most pressing information is and go from there.

KC responded to Tom's earlier comment by saying that this group (PWAC) is recommending the \$5/month increase every 5 year but the Council will take that recommendation and will do whatever they want to do with it. KC said that he is not comfortable is saying to reduce things because it doesn't have a chance of passing.

Tom rebutted by saying that if you don't a Plan A, B or C you may get Plan A yes or no so you had better have a Plan B or C or we could not get enough.

KC responded that instead of saying we are comfortable with \$5 or \$10/month or whatever it is, the plan should be the priority and showing we need to do this, this and this. It will cost \$X.xx to do this and \$X.xx to do this etc...

Tom said that one of the raspberry seeds we have right now is the "smart meter". The smart meter is 10% of the cost and it is arguably a cost benefit/break even because you won't have to pay meter readers to do reads each month. Tom would like to break that out so that is better understood by the council.

KC clarified that what he is trying to express is that if we are going to have an alternate plan he would rather have an alternate that says "here is the priority of projects" rather than "I'm comfortable with a \$2.50 increase over 10 years rather than 5 years.."

Reed said that staff has generated what we believe is the best and ranked the priority projects. Whatever the Council decides to do we have offered our professional opinion and recommendation and this body (PWAC) has endorsed it as well. If the Council chooses to move

forward we know how much it costs to do each project and if they decrease that amount they are shifting and delaying projects to be done in the future and slowing things down. We know we will be paying as we go but we won't be paying as aggressively because we won't have the funding we are anticipating and could potentially lead to having to bond if it involves one of the projects that got postponed.

Mr. Wood likes the idea of a priority mailing. He got the original information sheet in the mail and that is what brought him to our meeting. He said as read "this is everything we want to do and this is the cost" he felt it was a little overwhelming. As he looked at it he realized that in five years we will be paying \$46/month more for our public utilities which is more than double what we are paying now. He looked at that as a citizen and wanted more information. He figures that in five years he will be paying almost the same amount for his public utilities as his property tax. He said that is a big pill for him to swallow. He would like something like a priority list that points out what needs to be done and the cost of each project. He feels that some of the projects on the information sheet can be postponed whereas others are at the point where they need to be done now. He is concerned that we are going to increase the rates every year for five years to complete the project and questions if the will the rates go down at the end of 5 years? Will they stay the same amount? He feels that bonding is not necessarily a good thing, but at least there is a finite period of time for the bond to be paid off and the bond fee is done. He feels that when you tell the average citizen that their utility bill will be going up \$600/year you will hurt a lot of people. He understands that there are a lot of things that need to be done, but maybe not doing them all at once. He came to the meeting today to voice this concern.

Chris thanked him for sharing his opinion. He pointed out that at the Open House there was a prioritized list. He said that maybe we need to do a better job of getting that information out to the public by possibly getting it mailed out as well.

Reed pointed out that the three systems we are working on are massive. There never will be an end to general maintenance and upgrading. The effort is to pay as you go.

Mr. Wood is just concerned that the utility rates will keep increasing to the point where we are pricing our utilities out of realm of the citizens.

Reed pointed out that had we done these projects 10 years ago and increased the rates \$1/month over the next 10 years we wouldn't be having this discussion now. If we say "let's only do half of these projects" we will be having this discussion again in 10 years and we will have higher increases then. The plan we have right now is to increase it to get to a point that all we have to do is adjust for inflation in the future.

Mr. Wood pointed out doing the wells. He said he understands that Orem currently has an overabundance of water and we are actually selling it to other cities. He is suggesting developing wells at a later date perhaps after the five years since we have an overabundance of water now.

Chris displayed a large poster. It showed how much debt we have accrued in a 5 year period. From 2005 to 2010 there were 4 bonds issued to the City of Orem totaling \$52.5 million of total debt including principle and interest. The annual payments for Water, Sewer and Storm Water have to go towards paying for this debt. He wants everyone to know that if we continue down this path we will have a reduced net effect on our capital facilities throughout the City of Orem. Approximately 40% of the value is going towards interest payments so we don't have 100% going towards the Capital Improvements Projects. The visual identifies every single one of the bonds or notes that we have.

Tom asked about the color representation.

Chris said that the blue represents the “2005A Water and Storm Sewer Bond.” The graphic also identifies all that we were able to accomplish with the principle as well as all the interest going to the bank. The visual also shows a \$3,000,000 bond that also went to Water and Storm Sewer. The visual also includes and 0% loan from the State that went towards the expansion of the Water Reclamation facility. Chris said this speaks to Mr. Wood’s question as to what is palatable for the public and what they deem acceptable. Do we want to pay for things through credit, through bonding or do we want to pay as we go with cash? This is the very heart of this discussion. He also reminded us of what Reed spoke about that we have to hit a certain level or we feel like we can maintain in to the future if we have this kind of approach if we have a “pay-as-as-you-go” plan. In order to do this we have to set our rates appropriately. Chris agrees with what has been said in that if we do not approach it in a 5 year time frame or a 7 year or 10 years or re-evaluate what is needed. We feel like all of this will be re-evaluated at least every year in terms of rates. We would like to do a master plan for each one of these utilities at least every 5-10 years. If it makes sense to reduce our rates then we should do that. If it doesn’t, then we shouldn’t reduce them.

Tom said that is a scary statement to say because we could always find things to spend the money on. He reminded Chris that he said we would spend it and didn’t say that we would honor our prioritized projects.

Chris said that was the intent to spend on the prioritized projects as designed by professional engineers.

Tom felt better about that.

KC asked about the length of the bonds.

Chris said they are typically 20 year bonds. The current bonds expire in 2025, 2025, 2028 and 2032 respectively. As such we continue to pay for projects that were built 10 years ago all the way up until 2032.

KC pointed out that the length of the bond is almost the length of time we will have on the life of the projects that we did 10 years ago. He also pointed out that he has never know Orem or any other city to say “well, the bond is done so we are going to reduce our utility rates”. Twenty five years later growth has occurred and we have to use that utility money to pay for new bond plus an increase.

Mr. Wood asked how much area is left in the City for growth.

Tai pointed out that new growth will be vertical growth.

Mr. Wood said that he has lived in Orem for the past 25 years and has seen tremendous growth in that time. He wondered if we anticipate that growth rate to continue at a fast rate.

Chris said that Orem’s expected population cap is around 130,000. We are currently at 90,000.

Neal pointed out that growth is not the challenge but the existing infrastructure is as we;; as the existing need for storage, the existing need to replace meters, the existing need to have a pipeline replacement plan. Growth is part of the challenge down the road but it isn’t part of today’s challenge. We aren’t inventing the need to spend money on our system. What the graph on the visual shows is that previous City Councils decided to take care of this need differently. Now we have racked up a credit bill. We are paying that credit bill. Part of our revenues are going to pay for this debt. In Water alone the debt is about \$1,400,000 per year. That goes to pay for the bonds so we can’t spend it on other infrastructure. We have made a mind shift to pay as you go. Not only are we paying past debt, we are paying as we go and trying to not bond in the future. This creates a large utility bill increase. We have artificially kept our rates low by creating

debt for ourselves. So if we want to bond and create more debt that *is* a solution. But that is not direction this commission directed us and is not the direction the Council directed us. To say “well we just can’t swallow a utility fee increase” that’s ok. Other Cities are charging a lot more than we are proposing currently. Neal said that he isn’t sure what we are supposed to say when you say \$46 is too much and \$5 is acceptable. That is not the way to back in to the program. We need to ask ourselves what is needed and either pay as you go or create more debt or roll the dice on having pipes break and hole open up and pay more in operations. We are going to pay more in operations going out to fix leaks and emergency repairs.

Mr. Wood said that he agrees as a business owner. You have to keep business infrastructure in place. You have to keep it maintained. But you have to do it on a scheduled basis.

Tai interrupted to keep the meeting moving on schedule. He turned time over to Reed for the State of the Fleet overview (found in the handout from our June 2015 meeting).

Reed recognized Kim Watson who is retiring in a week. Kim has been in the business for 30 years. With Kim’s expertise and others within the department we have a plan in place to make sure that the City has the vehicles it needs to conduct business.

In 2014 we had 886 units of which 347 were vehicles. The remaining is small equipment. We have 3 full-time mechanics that work on pool vehicles up to the \$1 million fire trucks. We have another employee that focuses solely on the small equipment.

Last year there was an effort to right-size our vehicles. Previously retiring vehicles were assigned to someone else that had a legitimate need at the time. The attempt to right-size was to look at each vehicle and make sure it was in fact being used and that it was needed. There was a decision to reduce the fleet by 36 vehicles which would save approximately \$72,000/year. By removing those vehicles it will save close to \$1 million in future replacements. This is an ongoing effort.

When it is time to retire a vehicle there will be a determination of whether or not it should be replaced. We want to be sure to replace a vehicle when it needs to be replaced. That is why the City has hired Kim who has the expertise and knowledge to know when the best time is to do those replacements. Kim has developed some standards to determine when vehicles should be replaced. The standards are based on information from various sources. The criteria used is: age – how old is the vehicle, how many miles or hours are on the vehicle (many of our police vehicles have a lot of idle time on them and idle time is not good for an engine), the useful life of the vehicle – how much time has the vehicle spent in the shop in downtime and repairs, the overall condition and an exceedance factor – some vehicles that have not been replaced in some time and have exceed all of the other areas. There are also different criteria for different departments.

Our IT department has developed a program for the Fleet. Reed showed the visual for vehicle #8200, a 1997 Ford dump truck which has 150,623 miles. The usual limit is 125,000 miles. It is 18.5 years old. We would like to replace this at 15 years. (Please refer to the June handout for this information). Each year we prioritize which vehicles need to be replaced. We will replace those with the available budget. Reed showed another vehicle example from the visual, vehicle 470 which is a 1996 For F250 which is 18.6 yrs old and a life cost of \$10,625.59 when the limit life cost is \$2,000. There were several years when we had no funds to replace vehicles so out of necessity we had to repair rather than replace.

Tom asked if there were sheets like this on each vehicle.

Kim replied that there is one for every City vehicle as well as each piece of small equipment.

Reed showed several other vehicle information sheets from the computer program.

Carol asked what we do with vehicles we are getting rid of.

Reed said that they go to the auto auction. We have created a program to replace our vehicles which is basically a sinking fund. We save as we go and then buy when we have the funds available and expect to replace those vehicles. This creates financial stability. However it does require a long term commitment to funding this.

Another visual shows different types of vehicles in the City. Reed point to 4 patrol sedans. We like to replace them every 8 years and the mileage threshold is about 100,000 miles. Reed also said that we lease Harley Davidson motorcycles for the Police Department. He went over other types of vehicles as well as the thresholds for those vehicles.

Our historic method of funding vehicle replacements is from the General Fund and if there is extra unspent money in the General Fund. From 2007 to 2012 there was not much extra money so there were no vehicle replacements. If there is no extra General Fund money we don't get to replace vehicles. In two years over the last 5 years we have done nothing. The other 3 years we have done inadequate amounts of purchases.

Funding is critical for a good, safe, and reliable fleet. Our goal is to replace them on the schedule presented and to not keep vehicles longer than necessary due to extensive maintenance costs. How much is funding is needed? Citywide we need about \$3 million/year for vehicle replacement. From the General Fund we would require \$1.5 million annually. Tom pointed out that in the last 5 years we have spent between \$0-\$600,000 for vehicle replacements, which puts us way behind. The Water section needs about \$350,000 annually for vehicle replacement.

The Utility Rate Master Plan includes these numbers need on an annual basis for vehicle replacement.

Chris pointed out that the needs at Public Works are great due to the use of different types of equipment and more equipment than other departments. The JetVac truck that used to clean sewer lines and storm sewer systems cost \$350,000 for one vehicle. If we purchased one each year, it would eat up the entire budget for one year. Thankfully we have those on a 10 year rotation. We have developed a sinking fund for each one of our sections for vehicle purchases. We may not spend all the funds that year on purchases but we may push some of those funds in to the next year or two or possibly even three years so we can save to fund a JetVac truck purchase as well as other pieces of equipment. This is also pay-as-you-go funding to avoid bonding.

KC asked if these monies are identified in the budget as a reserve for vehicle replacement.

Chris said that is identified in the budget as a line item for this particular piece of equipment to be rolled over from year to year until we actually make the purchase.

Reed showed a graph that shows the age of the fleet from 1985 to 2013. Due to the downturn of the economy around 2007 we pushed back purchases so we are spending more than we probably should on maintenance. We could better use our money if we could bring that average age back down. We would like to have it down to 8-9 years for age of vehicle.

We have considered leasing vehicles. There are some communities that like leasing their fleet vehicles. We determined that it best for us to continue as we have been doing and own our vehicles. The next visual showed the options of leasing, closed in leases, etc... Leasing is typically more expensive because the rental or leasing company assumes most of the risk. There

is also an open ended lease where the consumer assumes the risk. We have determined that in most cases leasing is not our best option. The Police Department determined that it was best for them to lease motorcycles and the Major Crimes Task Force decided this year to test lease vehicles. They put 25,000-30,000 miles per year on their vehicles due to the nature of their work.

We own one backhoe and lease the others. Chris said the leasing the backhoes may not make the most financial sense but it is a critical piece of equipment in the time of an emergency event. We need to make sure that the backhoes are functioning and well maintained. With the lease program, the leasing company will come and change the rubber, the hoses, hydraulics and make sure it well maintained. We pay a little bit more for that but it is an insurance policy for the backhoes.

Kim pointed out that we are actually saving money by leasing the backhoes. The companies that we lease them from are able to get a government rate to buy them and able to take them back and sell them for nearly what they originally paid for them. He said that they lease them to us for the annual cost of depreciation without maintenance costs. They also carry the warranty and maintenance costs. So it is a cost savings to us.

Lawrence said that they actually made money on a leased front end loader last year. When we returned it, they gave us a check for \$4,500. We got a brand new front end loader plus a check for \$4,500!

Reed went on to the Replacement visual. The recommendations of the Fleet Management Plan are to establish a vehicle replacement program that supports the funding of vehicles and its replacement on an ongoing basis, to consider leasing where it makes sense and to establish a replacement fund or sinking fund to replace those vehicles in the future and to surplus and sell all vehicles when they are replaced. This also helps to keep vehicles from shifting from one department to another.

We want to standardize the Fleet where ever possible. We are purchasing Ford Taurus' for the Police as well as some Ford Explorers. These vehicles have the same chassis and transmission which makes it easier for the mechanics to make repairs.

Reed said we want the departments to monitor the size of their Fleet on an ongoing basis to make sure it is the correct size. We also want to make sure the vehicles are of an appropriate size of what is needed. We also classify the vehicles in different categories such as 1) is it essential which means it will be replaced in the future, 2) essential/non replaceable which are vehicles that will always be needed but don't require a new vehicle such as an ambulance that sits at the ready just in case something happens and then 3) non-essential which are vehicles that are not used very much.

Reed opened it up to questions regarding the Fleet program.

Luke asked if there was any there was any discount price for a group purchase.

Mr. Wood explained it as looking at the police vehicles where some are past life, some are at life and some are not quite at the end of their life. If those were to be replaced all at once, would there be a discount for a large group replacement.

Reed explained that it would be huge expense and we wouldn't have the funding in the General Fund to do that. We would have to save over several years in order to do that type of group purchase or bond for that. We haven't looked at this because the size of that purchase and the need to keep the Fleet running.

Neal explained that the cost is not just Orem City purchasing vehicles. The State publishes rates based on what dealers are willing to sell them for under a State Contract. All entities in the State are able to purchase at that particular State Contract price.

Kim said that with the State Contract we can actually purchase the vehicles for less than the dealers pay for them because of the Government/State Contract pricing.

Tai *asked for a motion* to approve the minutes. Neal asked for changes on page 4 in the last paragraph to clarify the cost estimates. Bill *made a motion* to approve the minutes with the changes. KC *seconded the motion*. Minutes were unanimously approved. Tai turned some additional time over to Chris for future agenda items and field trips.

Chris reminded everyone about the Open House tonight from 6:00-8:00 pm at the Senior Friendship Center. He would like as many PWAC members to attend if they can. He also said we would like to have some Field Trips in the future. We recently completed a \$2.3 million project at Alta Springs. It would require some time to go to the springs just above Timpanogos Park. It is a four-wheel drive road to get to the springs but he feels it would be worthwhile to go. We could go as an entire committee or as individuals. It would require 2.5 hours of time to go. Carol would like to go.

KC reminded that there will be a dedication of the expansion at the Water Treatment Plant on October 1st. Part of the expansion included adding ozone. This was a \$45 million project and Orem gets 60% of their water from this. He would love to have the PWAC members attend.

Tai said he would like to do both the Alta Springs tour as well as the Water Treatment Plan dedication.

Lane said that if we wait 3-4 weeks we could combine it with the Canyon Springs project as well.

Reed said that if anyone wants some hands on experiences to contact himself or Neal and we can take them out and show them what our crews do each day.

Tom had one other comment after he reflected on some things Neal said earlier in the meeting about the heavy bonding we did in 2005. We spent that from 2005-2010. We didn't spend any new, fresh money in 2007-2013 and now we are trying to do a pay-as-you-go. He said that is a squeeze. He said that he is not sure that we want the quote of him (Tom) saying "Future bonding would be a terrible thing" because that may be thing we need to do. He isn't sure he wants to go on record as saying bonding in terrible. This may be the reasonable thing. He thinks this is a challenge if we are building 20-30 assets and trying to pay for it in 5 years. He realizes that bonding wasn't popular then and it is less popular now.

Mr. Wood asked if there was a way we could do a combination of both.

Tom would like to have this as a future discussion item. He doesn't want to be on record as saying that and then vote for a bond and then have someone call him on it. He doesn't want to have do a fix mid-stream.

Tai asked Chris if he could put some numbers together for our next PWAC meeting regarding a combination of bonding and pay-as-you-go.

Tom said we probably don't have time until the September PWAC meeting because the City Council will be addressing this before.

KC asked if this was going before the City Council on September 8th as shown on the agenda.

Chris said that the put a question mark by this. We are gathering information at the Open House. We don't have a direction right now as to how to lay this out.

Tai *asked for a motion* to adjourn. KC *made a motion* to adjourn. Bill *seconded the motion*. Voting was unanimous to adjourn.

*After adjourning, Chris introduced our new member. He introduced Stan Roberts who served many years as the Provo River Water Commissioner. His father was the former commissioner. He has a wealth of knowledge and many years of experience.

Tai adjourned until the next meeting which is scheduled for September 15th.